

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 169

June 25, 1996, 5:03 p.m.
Page S-6834 Temp. Record

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/Quadrennial Defense Review & Independent Study

SUBJECT: National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 . . . S. 1745. Lieberman amendment No. 4156.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 100-0

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1745, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997, will authorize a total of \$267.3 billion in budget authority for national defense programs (the President requested \$254.3 billion). In real terms, this bill will authorize \$5.6 billion less, and the President requested \$18.6 billion less, than was provided in fiscal year (FY) 1996.

The Lieberman amendment would provide for Government and independent analyses of long-term defense needs, as follows:

- the Secretary of Defense would be required to report to Congress on the quadrennial defense review; certain specific issues would have to be considered (the Defense Department conducts this review every 4 years to assess the United States current strategy and force structure with the intention of using that assessment to form the basis of military planning through the next decade; the next review will be completed in the spring of 1997);
- two separate independent assessments would be made of the quadrennial review, one by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and one by the independent, nonpartisan National Defense Panel (that panel would be created by this amendment);
- the National Defense Panel would also be charged with developing a variety of alternative proposals for force structures and budgets, with a focus on developing an assessment of defense needs through 2010 and beyond where possible;
- threats that would be considered by these reviews include: the threat from weapons of mass destruction; conventional threats from the rise of radical Islamic fundamentalism and other political extremist movements; the vulnerability of our information systems and other advanced technologies to attack; the threat posed by terrorism; and the potential emergence of a new major military power; and
- other issues that the review would address include the following: the potential impact of allied cooperation on U.S. force size and structure; assumptions about warning times for future conflicts and planning for simultaneous conflicts; the affect changing technologies would have on defense needs; the type of defense forces needed for peace operations and other military operations other than war; the appropriate mix of active and reserve forces; and the inadvisability of determining the size of a defense budget first

(See other side)

YEAS (100)				NAYS (0)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republican (53 or 100%)		Democrats (47 or 100%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms	Akaka	Inouye				
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Baucus	Johnston				
Bennett	Inhofe	Biden	Kennedy				
Bond	Jeffords	Bingaman	Kerrey				
Brown	Kassebaum	Boxer	Kerry				
Burns	Kempthorne	Bradley	Kohl				
Campbell	Kyl	Breaux	Lautenberg				
Chafee	Lott	Bryan	Leahy				
Coats	Lugar	Bumpers	Levin				
Cochran	Mack	Byrd	Lieberman				
Cohen	McCain	Conrad	Mikulski				
Coverdell	McConnell	Daschle	Moseley-Braun				
Craig	Murkowski	Dodd	Moynihan				
D'Amato	Nickles	Dorgan	Murray				
DeWine	Pressler	Exon	Nunn				
Domenici	Roth	Feingold	Pell				
Faircloth	Santorum	Feinstein	Pryor				
Frahm	Shelby	Ford	Reid				
Frist	Simpson	Glenn	Robb				
Gorton	Smith	Graham	Rockefeller				
Gramm	Snowe	Harkin	Sarbanes				
Grassley	Specter	Heflin	Simon				
Gregg	Stevens	Hollings	Wellstone				
Hatch	Thomas		Wyden				
Hatfield	Thompson						
	Thurmond						
	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Buisiness
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

and then making a defense needs analysis fit that budget (as was done in the Clinton Bottom Up Review).

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Lieberman amendment would correct a shortcoming in defense planning that is common to almost all Government planning, which is that little attention is paid to developing long-term assessments of future needs and strategies for meeting those needs. We in Congress are as guilty as any agency of failing to make more than incremental changes. The Defense Department, to its credit, conducts the Quadrennial Review, which takes a multi-year look, but that review is not enough. It needs to be expanded, and longer term assessments need to be made, both by the Defense Department and by independent analysts. The Lieberman amendment would require analyses on such matters as the types of defense activities the military is likely to be called upon to perform over the next couple of decades, the types of defense forces that will best perform those activities, the types of new threats that will emerge, and the role our allies will play. Assessments would be made by an independent review board that would be created by the amendment, as well as by the Defense Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The last attempt to conduct an overall review of defense policy, the Clinton Bottom Up Review, is deeply flawed because it started out with how much the Clinton Administration said it was willing to spend and defense needs were then drawn around that number. Unfortunately, President Clinton has fought attempts to provide funding by even as much as that review requested, with the result being that all analyses that we have seen, including from the Clinton Administration itself, show that our defense needs as defined in the Bottom Up Review are seriously underfunded in the outyears. We are refusing to invest the money that is needed now to provide the security that will be needed in the future. The Lieberman amendment would hopefully lead to a correction of this alarming disconnect between what the United States says its national security needs will be in a few years and its ability to meet those future needs. We urge our colleagues to give this amendment their support.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.